



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/302,471 04/30/99 SHIBUYA

T 774-98129

WENDEROTH LIND & PONACK LLP
SUITE 800
2033 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20006

IM52/0822

EXAMINER

BRUNSMAN, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1755

DATE MAILED:

08/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/302,471

Applicant(s)

SHIBUYA ET AL.

Examiner

David M Brunsman

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1755

The request filed on 26 June 2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/302471 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7 and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takei et al.

The reference teaches a method of forming a coating composition and coating a substrate wherein 100g TMOS, 500g of methanol, 360g of DMF and, 266g of THF alcohol are admixed. To this composition are added 1.2×10^{-4} moles ammonium compound base per 100g silane compound and 390g water. The composition is deposited on a substrate and dried at 50-180°C. The material is baked at 1400-1500°C. During processing the composition passes through 5-25% by weight silane condensate in terms of SiO₂ during drying wherein the alcohol solvent is volatilized and replaced with DMF. During baking the material passes through 350-800 C.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei et al as applied above, and further in view of Tomikawa et al.

Art Unit: 1755

The difference between Takei et al and the instant claims is the base catalyst employed. Paragraph 22 of Tomikawa et al teach that ammonium compounds, ammonia and other amines are all known in the instant art as basic amine catalysts for similar compositions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ an ammonia catalyst because Tomikawa et al teaches it is equivalent to the bases of Takei et al.

In determining the relevant art one looks to the nature of the problem confronting the inventor. *Weather Engineering Corp. of America v. United States*, 204 USPQ 41, 46-47.

Having thus determined the scope and content of the prior art and the level of skill in the said art at the time the invention was made, it is the examiner's position that the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The mere failure of a reference to disclose all the advantages asserted by applicant is no a substitute for actual differences in properties. *In re DeBlauwe*, 222 USPQ 191. An apparently old composition cannot be converted into an unobvious one simply by the discovery of a characteristic one cannot glean from the cited prior art. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773.

Accordingly, the burden of proof is upon applicant to show that the instantly claimed subject matter is different from and unobvious over that taught by the prior art relied upon. *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685, 689; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430; *In re Marosi*, 21 USPQ 289, 293.

Any evidence to be presented under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely. It is anticipated that the next office action will be a final rejection.

Any foreign language documents submitted by applicant have been considered to the extent the short explanation of significance, English abstract or English equivalent allow.

Art Unit: 1755

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M Brunsman whose telephone number is 703-308-3454.

The examiner can normally be reached on M, Tu, Th, F (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on 703-308-3823. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9049 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

David M Brunsman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DMB', written over a horizontal line.

DMB
August 21, 2001